UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/497,992	02/04/2000	Steven T. Maller	MS1-353US	8151

22801   7590   07/02/2003

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER
BAUGH, APRIL L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/497,992	MALLER, STEVEN T.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	April L Baugh	2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-70* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-70* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

     If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

     a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in

37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e)

has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 25, 2003 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 12 and added new claims 53-70 therefore claims 1-

70 are now pending.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-70 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No.

5,999,932 to Paul in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) and further in view of Cobb.

Regarding to claim 1, Paul teaches an email filtering method (column 1, lines 6-9)

comprising: defining at least one heuristic that determines whether an incoming email message

likely constitutes unsolicited commercial email by considering an established pattern that such

unsolicited commercial email typically exhibits when it is sent; applying said at least one

heuristic to at least one email message (column 2, lines 7-9) redirecting said at least one email

message wherein said redirecting comprises placing a copy of the email message at a location

not dedicated to storage of just one particular user's email (column 7, lines 15-25, 36-50 and

column 7, line 63 through column 8, lines 4).

Paul does not teach a web server as part of the web-based email system and a client user

interface email environment generated through the use of HTML or web pages. AAPA teaches a

web server that comprises part of a web-based email system (pg.1, lines 8-10 and 18-21 of

AAPA) in which, for at least some users of the system, a client user interface email environment

is generated through use of HTML or web pages (pg.2, lines 8-10 and 11-13 of AAPA).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering unsolicited email of

Paul by having a web server as part of the web-based email system and a client user interface

email environment generated through the use of HTML or web pages because this helps the

system manage the exchange of email over multiple networks and an email environment

generated through web pages is easily accessible from any client.

Paul in view of AAPA does not teach redirecting emails are likely to be unsolicited commercial email. Cobb teaches redirecting said at least one email message if application of said at least one heuristic indicates that said at least one email message likely constitutes an unsolicited commercial email (column 3, lines 36-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering unsolicited email of Paul in view of AAPA by redirecting emails that are likely to be unsolicited commercial email because by placing all unsolicited emails in one location the system is able to save storage space.

Referring to claim 2, Paul in view of AAPA teaches the email filtering method of claim 1 (column 1, lines 6-9 of Paul).

Paul in view of AAPA does not teach of redirecting an email message. Cobb teaches said redirecting comprises placing a copy of the email message at a single location from which it can be accessed by more than one intended recipient of the email message (column 3, lines 36-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering unsolicited email of Paul in view of AAPA by said redirecting comprises placing a copy of the email message at a single location from which it can be accessed by more than one intended recipient of the email message because by placing all unsolicited emails in one location the system is able to save storage space.

Referring to claim 5, Paul in view of AAPA teaches the email filtering method of claim 1 (column 1, lines 6-9 of Paul), wherein said at least one heuristic considers a pattern associated with the email message (column 2, lines 7-9 of Paul).

Paul in view of AAPA does not teach at least one heuristic considers a pattern associated

with the number of specified recipient addresses. Cobb teaches said at least one heuristic

considers a pattern associated with the number of specified recipient addresses of the email

message (column 16, lines 25-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for

filtering unsolicited email of Paul in view of AAPA by said at least one heuristic considers a

pattern associated with the number of specified recipient addresses of the email message because

a large number of recipient addresses is a characteristic of unsolicited email and therefore will

allow the system to identify junk email.

Regarding claim 3, Paul teaches the email filtering method of claim 1, wherein said defining

comprises defining a plurality of heuristics (column 2, line 7-9) that are independent of the

message conveyed by any of the content contained in an email message (column 1, lines 43-45

and 55-57).

Referring to claim 4, Paul teaches the email filtering method of claim 1, wherein said at

least one heuristic (column 2, lines 7-8) has at least one parameter that can be adjusted, and

further comprising adjusting said at least one parameter to vary the pattern that is considered

(column 2, lines 16-17).

3.   Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No.

5,999,932 to Paul in view of AAPA and further in view of Cobb as applied to claims 1-5 above,

and further in view of Mullan et al.

Regarding claim 6, Paul in view of AAPA and further in view of Cobb teaches the email

filtering method of claim 5 (column 1, lines 6-9 of Paul).

Paul in view of AAPA and further in view of Cobb does not teach the pattern is

associated with the number of invalid specified recipient addresses. Mullan et al. teaches the

pattern is associated with the number of invalid specified recipient addresses (column 10, lines

37-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering unsolicited email

of Paul in view of AAPA and further in view of Cobb by having the pattern be associated with

the number of invalid specified recipient addresses because a large number of invalid recipient

addresses is a characteristic of unsolicited email and therefore will allow the system to identify

junk email.

4.   Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent

No. 5,999,932 to Paul in view of AAPA and further in view of Cobb as applied to claims 1-5

above, and further in view of Stockwell et al. (US Pat. No. 6,072,942).

Regarding claim 7, Paul in view of AAPA and further in view of Cobb teaches the email

filtering method of claim 1 (column 1, lines 6-9 of Paul) wherein said at least one heuristic

considers a pattern associated with the email message (column 2, lines 7-9 of Paul).

Paul in view of AAPA and further in view of Cobb does not teach at least one heuristic

considers a pattern associated with the size of an email message. Stockwell et al. teaches at least

one heuristic considers a pattern associated with the size of an email message (column 15, lines

21-22 and 33-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering

unsolicited email of Paul in view of AAAP and in further view of Cobb by having at least one

heuristic consider a pattern associated with the size of an email message because an email large

in size is a characteristic of unsolicited email and therefore will allow the system to identify junk

email.

Referring to claim 8, Paul in view of AAPA and further in view of Cobb teaches the

email filtering method of claim 1 (column 1, lines 6-9 of Paul) wherein said at least one heuristic

considers patterns associated with the number of specified recipient addresses of the email

message (column 16, lines 25-30 of Cobb).

Paul in view of AAPA and further in view of Cobb does not teach that the heuristic

considers the size of the email message. Stockwell teaches the heuristic considers patterns

associated with the size of the email message (column 15, lines 21-22 and 33-35). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to further modify the system and method for filtering unsolicited email of Paul in view of

AAPA and further in view of Cobb by having the heuristic consider the size of the email

message because many unsolicited emails have the characteristic of being larger size emails

therefore this heuristic will help identify junk emails.

5.   Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent

No. 5,999,932 to Paul in view of AAPA and further in view of Cobb as applied to claim 1-5

above, and further in view of Sakaguchi et al.

Regarding claim 9, Paul in view of AAPA and further in view of Cobb teaches the email

filtering method of claim 1 (column 1, lines 6-9 of Paul).

Paul in view of AAPA and further in view of Cobb does not teach notifying at least one

intended recipient that an email message intended for them has been redirected. Sakaguchi et al.

teaches after said redirecting, notifying at least one intended recipient that an email message

intended for them has been redirected (column 8, lines 22-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering unsolicited email of Paul in view of AAPA and further in view of Cobb by after said redirecting, notifying at least one intended recipient that an email message intended for them has been redirected because this way the recipient will know where to locate the unsolicited email if they choose to read it.

Referring to claim 10, Paul in view of AAPA and further in view of Cobb teaches the email filtering method of claim 1 (column 1, lines 6-9 of Paul).

Paul in view of AAPA and further in view of Cobb does not teach redirecting said at least one email message and notifying intended recipients of the email message. Sakaguchi et al. teaches redirecting comprising redirecting said at least one email message to a location that can be shared by a plurality of intended recipients for reading said email message (column 8, lines 31-34), and further comprising after said redirecting, notifying intended recipients of the email message that an email message intended for them has been redirected to said location (column 8, lines 22-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering unsolicited email of Paul in view of AAPA and further in view of Cobb by redirecting said at least one email message and notifying intended recipients of the email message that an email message intended for them has been redirected because placing all unsolicited emails in one location the system is able to save storage space and notification will allow the recipient to know where to locate the unsolicited email if they choose to read it.

Regarding claim 11, Paul in view of AAPA and further in view of Cobb teaches the email

filtering method of claim 10 (column 1, lines 6-9 of Paul).

Paul in view of AAPA and further in view of Cobb does not teach redirecting comprises

storing only one copy of the email message. Sakaguchi et al. teaches said redirecting comprises

storing only one copy of the email message (column 2, lines 3-4 and column 8, lines 31-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering unsolicited email of

Paul in view of AAPA and further in view of Cobb by having redirecting comprise storing only

one copy of the email message because placing only one copy of all unsolicited emails in one

location the system is able to save storage space.

6.   Claims 12-15, 24-27, 29, 30, 33-36, 38, 40, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,199,102 to Cobb in view of AAPA and further in view

of Paul and Stockwell et al. (US Patent No. 6,072,942), and further in view of Sakaguchi et al.

Regarding claim 12, Cobb teaches an email filtering method (column 2, lines 21-23 of

Cobb) comprising: receiving an email message at an email server that maintains inboxes for

individual recipients (column 2, lines 34-35 of Cobb), wherein the email message is addressed to

a plurality of recipients (column 16, line 21-23 of Cobb); determining unwanted emails for the

email message at the server location based upon at least one of (b) the number of specified

recipient addresses; comparing this with a threshold value that defines a likelihood of whether an

email message constitutes an unwanted email message (column 16, lines 25-30 of Cobb).

Cobb does not teach the email server being a part of the Internet-based email system and the

creation of a user interface email environment through web pages or HTML. AAPA teaches the

email server comprising part of an Internet-based email system (pg.1, lines 8-10 and 18-21 of AAPA) in which, for at least some users of the system, a client user interface email environment is generated through use of HTML or web pages (pg.2, lines 8-10 and 11-13 of AAPA). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb by having the email server being a part of the Internet-based email system and the creation of a user interface email environment through web pages or HTML because this helps the system manage the exchange of email over multiple networks and an email environment generated through web pages is easily accessible from any client.

Cobb in view of AAPA does not teach of placing a copy of the email message at a first location other than an individual storage location dedicated to an individual intended recipient of the email message. Paul teaches placing a copy of the email message at a first location other than an individual storage location dedicated to an individual intended recipient of the email message (column 7, lines 15-25, 36-50 and column 7, line 63 through column 8, lines 4). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA by placing a copy of the email message at a first location other than an individual storage location dedicated to an individual intended recipient of the email message because this saves storage space on the user system.

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul does not teach determining unwanted emails for the email message at the server location based upon the size of the email message. Stockwell teaches determining unwanted emails for the email message at the server location based upon at least one of (a) the size of the email message (column 15, lines 21-22 and 33-35 of Stockwell et al.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view

of AAPA and Paul by determining unwanted emails for the email message at the server location

based upon the size of the email message because this is a characteristic of unsolicited email

messages.

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. does not teach

calculating a score based on the patterns and comparing this score to a threshold and in turn if the

threshold is exceeded placing the email in a location and sending an notification to the intended

recipient. Sakaguchi et al. teaches calculating a score based on the patterns and comparing this

score to a threshold (column 6, lines 56-62) and responsive to the email message exceeding the

threshold value, placing a copy of the email message at a first location other than (column, lines

31-34); and sending a notification to the intended recipients that a copy of an email message that

was intended for them has been placed at the first location (column 8, lines 22-26).Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA and

Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. by calculating a score based on the patterns and

comparing this score to a threshold and in turn if the threshold is exceeded placing the email in a

location and sending an notification to the intended recipient because emails that are not junk

may possess some of the patterns and this score method helps the system to not junk emails that

are not unsolicited emails yet they may possess a couple of characteristics of junk email.

Referring to claim 13, Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul teaches the email filtering method

of claim 12 (column 2, lines 21-23 of Cobb).

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul does not teach the threshold value is determined independent of the message. Stockwell et al. teaches the threshold value (column 13, lines 64-65) is determined independent of the message conveyed by any of the text that is contained in any part of the email message (column 15, lines 22 and 33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul by having the threshold value be determined independent of the message conveyed by any of the text that is contained in any part of the email message because determining junk email by the content of the message is unreliable in that it may cause the system to identify solicited mail as junk mail and vice versa.

Regarding claim 14, Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul teaches junk email determination is based upon the number of specified recipient addresses (column 16, lines 25-30 of Cobb).

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul does not teach junk email determination is based upon both the size of the email message. Stockwell et al. teaches the email filtering method of claim 12, wherein junk email determination is based upon both the size of the email message (column 15, lines 21-22 and 33-35 of Stockwell et al.) and the number of specified recipient addresses (column 16, lines 25-30 of Cobb). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul by junk email determination is based upon both the size of the email message because this is a characteristic of unsolicited email messages.

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. does not teach of a score. Sakaguchi et al. teaches of a score (column 6, lines 56-58). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further

modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further

in view of Stockwell et al. by calculating a score based on the patterns because emails that are

not junk may possess some of the patterns and this score method helps the system to not junk

emails that are not unsolicited emails yet they may possess a couple of characteristics of junk

email.

Referring to claim 24, Cobb teaches determining whether an email message that is

received by the email server likely constitutes an unwanted email message (column 2, lines 27-

29 of Cobb).

Cobb does not teach of an email server as part of the email system and a user

interface email environment created with HTML or web pages. AAPA teaches the email server

comprising part of a web-based email system (pg. 1, lines 8-10 and 18-21 of AAPA) in which, for

at least some users of the system, a client user interface email environment is generated through

use of HTML or web pages (pg. 2, lines 8-10 and 11-13 of AAPA). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further

modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb by having a web server as part of the

web-based email system and a client user interface email environment generated through the use

of HTML or web pages because this helps the system manage the exchange of email over

multiple networks and an email environment generated through web pages is easily accessible

from any client.

Cobb in view of AAPA does not teach email message likely constitutes an unwanted

email message: storing a copy of the email message at a first storage location rather than

individual storage locations that are dedicated to individual intended recipients of the email

message. Paul teaches email message likely constitutes an unwanted email message: storing a

copy of the email message at a first storage location rather than individual storage locations that

are dedicated to individual intended recipients of the email message (column 7, lines 15-25, 36-

50 and column 7, line 63 through column 8, lines 4). Therefore it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in

view of AAPA by email message likely constitutes an unwanted email message: storing a copy

of the email message at a first storage location rather than individual storage locations that are

dedicated to individual intended recipients of the email message because this saves storage space

on the user system.

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul does not teach computer-readable instructions.

Stockwell et al. teaches a programmed email server that contains computer-readable instructions

(column 6, line 28 and column 7, lines 52-55 of Stockwell et al.) Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further

modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul by having

computer readable instructions in the web server because these instructions direct the hardware

on how to process the information.

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. does not teach

storing an unwanted email and notifying the intended recipient. Sakaguchi et al. teaches if the

email message likely constitutes an unwanted email message: storing a copy of the email

message at a first storage location (column 8, lines 31-34); and notifying intended recipients of

the email message that an email message addressed to them has been received by the server

(column 8, lines 22-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. by storing an unwanted email and notifying the intended recipient because placing all unsolicited emails in one location the system is able to save storage space and the system can then notify the recipient so that they may view it at a time that is convenient to them.

Referring to claim 26, Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. teaches the steps of claim 24 (column 2, lines 27-29 of Cobb).

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. does not teach enabling intended recipients to read the email message Sakaguchi et al. teaches enabling intended recipients, if they so desire, to read the email message at the first storage location (column 1, lines 21-23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA and further in view of Stockwell et al. by enabling intended recipients, if they so desire, to read the email message at the first storage location because although the email has been identified as unsolicited the recipient after reading the email may be interested in its contents.

Referring to claim 29, Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul teaches the steps of claim 24 (column 2, lines 27-29 of Cobb).

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul does not teach determining takes place by considering the size of the email message Stockwell et al. teaches said determining takes place by considering the size of the email message (column 15, lines 21-22 and 33-35). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further

modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul by having

said determining take place by considering the size of the email message because many

unsolicited emails have the characteristic of being larger size emails therefore this heuristic will

help identify junk emails.

Referring to claim 34, Cobb an email screening method comprising: developing a profile of

unsolicited commercial email based upon the number of specified recipient addresses of the

email message (column 16, lines 25-30 of Cobb).

Cobb does not teach of an email server as part of the email system and a user

interface email environment created with HTML or web pages. AAPA teaches the mail server

comprising part of a web-based email system (pg.1, lines 8-10 and 18-21 of AAPA) in which, for

at least some users of the system, a client user interface email environment is generated through

use of HTML or web pages that are sent to client devices (pg.2, lines 8-10 and 11-13 of AAPA).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb by

having a web server as part of the web-based email system and a client user interface email

environment generated through the use of HTML or web pages because this helps the system

manage the exchange of email over multiple networks and an email environment generated

through web pages is easily accessible from any client.

Cobb in view of AAPA does not teach if an email message fits the developed

profile, initiating a remedial measure that ensures that the mail server does not make as many

copies of the email message as there are specified recipient addresses. Paul teaches if an email

message fits the developed profile, initiating a remedial measure that ensures that the mail server

does not make as many copies of the email message as there are specified recipient addresses

(column 7, lines 15-25, 36-50 and column 7, line 63 through column 8, lines 4). Therefore it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system and method for

filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA by if an email message fits the developed profile,

initiating a remedial measure that ensures that the mail server does not make as many copies of

the email message as there are specified recipient addresses because this will save storage on the

user system.

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul does not teach developing a profile of unsolicited

commercial email based upon the size of an email message. Stockwell et al. teaches developing a

profile of unsolicited commercial email based upon the size of an email message (column 15,

lines 21-22 and 33-35 of Stockwell et al.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and

method for filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul by developing a profile of

unsolicited commercial email based upon the size of an email message because this is a

characteristic of junk mail.

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. does not teach a

mail server that stores and distributes email based on a profile. Sakaguchi et al. teaches

configuring a mail server that is responsible for storing and distributing email messages to a

plurality of clients with a filter processor that is programmed to evaluate email messages that are

received in light of the developed profile; evaluating email messages with the filter processor and

determining whether the email messages fit the developed profile(column 1, line 67 through

column 2, line 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. by having a mail server that stores and distributes email based on a profile because a profile of the characteristics of junk email help to identify unsolicited email and placing all unsolicited emails in one location the system is able to save storage space.

Referring to claim 36, Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. teaches the email screening method of claim 34 (column 15, lines 21-22 and 33-35 of Stockwell et al.) and (column 16, lines 25-30 of Cobb).

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. does not teach storing one copy of the email message at a server storage location and notifying intended recipients. Sakaguchi et al. teaches said remedial measure comprises storing one copy of the email message at a server storage location, instead of storing multiple copies of the email message for the specified recipient addresses (column 8, lines 31-34), and notifying intended recipients that an email message intended for them has been stored at the server storage location (column 8, lines 22-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. by storing one copy of the email message at a server storage location, instead of storing multiple copies of the email message for the specified recipient addresses, and notifying intended recipients that an email message intended for them has been stored at the server storage location because placing

all unsolicited emails in one location the system is able to save storage space and the system can

then notify the recipient so that they may view it at a time that is convenient to them.

Regarding claim 38, Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al.

teaches the email screening method of claim 37 (column 15, lines 21-22 and 33-35 of Stockwell

et al.) and (column 16, lines 25-30 of Cobb).

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. does not teach

reading the email message from the server storage to location. Sakaguchi et al. teaches for each

recipient who so desires, reading the email message from the server storage to location (column

1, lines 21-23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. by for each recipient

who so desires, reading the email message from the server storage to location because although

the email has been identified as unsolicited the recipient after reading the email may be

interested in its contents.

Regarding claim 40, Cobb teaches establishing a bulk email folder in which bulk email is to

be stored; comparing an address for the sender of the email message with a recipient's list of

approved senders; and delivering the email message to the single, shared location if: (a) the email

message is not directly addressed to a recipient that is serviced by the server, and (b) the sender's

address does not appear in the recipient's list of approved senders (column 3, lines 52-62 of

Cobb).

Cobb does not teach of an email server as part of the email system and a user

interface email environment created with HTML or web pages. AAPA teaches the email server

comprising part of an email system (pg. 1, lines 8-10 and 18-21 of AAPA) in which, for at least

some users of the system, a client user interface email environment is generated through use of

HTML or web pages that are sent to client devices (pg.2, lines 8-10 and 11-13 of AAPA).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb by

having a web server as part of the web-based email system and a client user interface email

environment generated through the use of HTML or web pages because this helps the system

manage the exchange of email over multiple networks and an email environment generated

through web pages is easily accessible from any client.

Cobb in view of AAPA does not teach an email server to receive email messages

and deliver them a single, shared location that can be shared by a plurality of the recipients;

receiving an email message. Paul teaches an email server to receive email messages and deliver

them a single, shared location that can be shared by a plurality of the recipients; receiving an

email message. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb

in view of AAPA by an email server to receive email messages and deliver them a single, shared

location that can be shared by a plurality of the recipients; receiving an email message because

this saves storage space on the user system.

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul does not teach and email delivery method. Stockwell et al.

teaches an email delivery method (column 2, lines 24-25 of Stockwell et al.). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul by

having an email delivery method because once the email is filtered it then needs to be delivered

to the recipient.

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. does not teach of

having an email server to receive email messages and deliver them either to multiple server

storage locations. Sakaguchi et al. teaches of configuring an email server to receive email

messages and deliver them to multiple server storage locations that are dedicated to storing email

messages for respective recipients (column 1, line 67 through column 2, line 4). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA and

Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. by having an email server to receive email messages

and deliver them either to multiple server storage locations because placing all unsolicited emails

in one location the system is able to save storage space.

Referring to claim 41, Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et

al. teaches the email delivery method of claim 40 (column 2, lines 24-25 of Stockwell et al.).

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. does not teach

maintaining the email message at the single, shared location only for a determinable amount of

time. Sakaguchi et al. teaches maintaining the email message at the single, shared location only

for a determinable amount of time (column 2, lines 37-40). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further

modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further

in view of Stockwell et al. by maintaining the email message at the single, shared location only

for a determinable amount of time because placing the junk emails at only one location and for a

limited amount of time saves storage space in the system for other use.

Regarding claim 15, Cobb teaches the email filtering method of claim 12, wherein said first

location is a storage location (column 3, lines 36-37) that is managed by the email server

(column 6, lines 17-19).

Regarding claim 25, Cobb teaches the steps of claim 24, wherein said determining

takes place (column 2, lines 21-23) without considering the message conveyed by any content of

the sender's address field, the subject field, or the message field (column 8, lines 42-47).

Regarding to claim 27, Cobb teaches the steps of claim 26, wherein said enabling

comprises doing so without making any copies of the copy of the email message at the first

storage location (column 3, lines 36-38).

Regarding claim 30, Cobb teaches the steps of claim 24, wherein said determining takes

place by 10 considering the number of specified recipient addresses of the email message

(column 16, lines 25-30).

Regarding claim 33, Cobb teaches the steps of claim 32, wherein the heuristics are

adjustable (column 17, lines 40-41).

Regarding claim 35, Cobb teaches the email screening method of claim 34, wherein said

remedial measure comprises storing one copy of the email message at a server storage location,

instead of storing multiple copies of the email message for the specified recipient addresses

(column 3, lines 36-38).

7.   Claims 16, 23, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

US Patent No. 6,199,102 to Cobb in view of AAPA and further in view of Stockwell et al. (US

Patent No. 6,072,942) and Sakaguchi et al. as applied to claims 12-15, 24-27, 29, 30, 34-36, 38, 40, and 41 above, and further in view of Mullan et al.

Regarding claim 16, Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al. teaches the email filtering method (column 2, lines 21-23 of Cobb) of claim 12 and of threshold values (column 13, lines 64-65 of Stockwell et al.).

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al. does not teach that the threshold is based upon the number of invalid specified recipient addresses. Mullan teaches of the number of invalid specified recipient addresses (column 10, lines 37-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al. by having the threshold be based upon the number of invalid specified recipient addresses because many unsolicited emails have the characteristic of having many invalid recipient addresses in the address field of a junk email therefore this heuristic will help identify junk emails.

Referring to claim 23, Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al. teaches the steps of claim 19 further comprising prior to said placing: defining a profile of unwanted email messages based upon at least one of: the size of an email message (column 15, lines 21-22 and 33-35 of Stockwell et al.) and the number of specified recipient addresses (column 16, lines 25-30 of Cobb); determining whether an email message meets the profile; and wherein said placing and said notifying takes place only if the email message meets the profile (column 8, lines 22-26 of Sakaguchi et al.).

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al. does not teach of the number of invalid specified recipient addresses. Mullan teaches of the number of invalid specified recipient addresses (column 10, lines 37-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al. by having unwanted email be based upon the number of invalid specified recipient addresses because many unsolicited emails have the characteristic of having many invalid recipient addresses in the address field of a junk email therefore this heuristic will help identify junk emails.

Referring to claim 31, Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al. teaches the steps of claim 24 (column 2, lines 27-29 of Cobb) and (column 8, lines 22-26 and lines 31-34 of Sakaguchi et al.).

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al. does not teach determining takes place by considering the number of invalid specified recipient addresses. Mullan teaches determining takes place by considering the number of invalid specified recipient addresses (column 10, lines 37-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al. by determining takes place by considering the number of invalid specified recipient addresses because many unsolicited emails have the characteristic of having many invalid recipient addresses in the address field of a junk email therefore this heuristic will help identify junk emails.

Regarding claim 32, Cobb teaches the steps of claim 24, wherein said determining

takes place by defining a plurality of heuristics that establish a profile of unwanted email

messages, wherein the profile considers factors that are independent of any message conveyed by

an email message's content, and applying the plurality of heuristics to an email message (column

17, line 40-41).

8.   Claims 17 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US

Patent No. 6,199,102 to Cobb in view of AAPA and further in view of Stockwell et al. (US

Patent No. 6,072,942) and Sakaguchi et al. as applied to claims 12-15, 24-27, 29, 30, 34-36, 38,

40 and 41 above, and further in view of Guck.

Regarding to claim 17, Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et

al. and Sakaguchi et al. teaches the email filtering method (column 2, lines 21-23 of Cobb) of

claim 12 and sending of the notification (column 8, lines 22-26 of Sakaguchi et al.).

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al.

does not teach of pointers. Guck teaches sending of the notification comprises placing a pointer

in an email folder of each recipient of the email message (column 15, lines 54-58). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA and

Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al. by placing a pointer in an email

folder of each recipient of the email message because this directs the recipient from their email

folder to the storage location where the unsolicited email is stored.

Referring to claim 37, Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et

al. and Sakaguchi et al. teaches the email screening method of claim 34, wherein said remedial

measure comprises storing one copy of the email message at a server storage location, instead of

storing multiple copies of the email message for the specified recipient addresses (column 8,

lines 31-34 of Sakaguchi et al.), and notifying intended recipients that an email message intended

for them has been stored at the server storage location (column 8, lines 22-26 of Sakaguchi et

al.).

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al.

does not teach of pointers. Guck teaches sending of the notification comprises placing a pointer

in an email folder of the intended recipients (column 15, lines 54-58). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further

modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further

in view of Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al. by placing a pointer in an email folder of the

intended recipients because this directs the recipient from their email folder to the storage

location where the unsolicited email is stored.

9.   Claims 18, 28, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US

Patent No. 6,199,102 to Cobb in view of AAPA and further in view of Stockwell et al. (US

Patent No. 6,072,942) and Sakaguchi et al. as applied to claims 12-15, 24-27, 29, 30, 34-36, 38,

40 and 41 above, and further in view of Paul.

Regarding claim 18, Cobb in view of AAPA and further in view of Stockwell et al. and

Sakaguchi et al. teaches the email filtering method of claim 12 further comprising making a

recipient copy of the email message and placing the recipient copy at a dedicated recipient

storage location (column 8, lines 31-34 of Sakaguchi et al.).

Cobb in view of AAPA and further in view of Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al. does not teach of storing a copy of the email responsive to a request from a recipient. Paul teaches of recipient request (column 1, lines 53-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA and further in view of Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al. by storing a copy of the email responsive to a request from a recipient because by placing the junk email in the recipients box only by request the system is able to save storage space.

Regarding claim 28, Cobb in view of AAPA and further in view of Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al. teaches the steps of claim 26 further comprising making a copy of the email message, and storing said copy at a recipient-specific location (column 8, lines 31-34 of Sakaguchi et al.).

Cobb in view of AAPA and further in view of Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al. does not teach of receiving instructions from an intended recipient that a copy of the email message is made specifically for them. Paul teaches of receiving instructions from an intended recipient (column 1, lines 53-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA and further in view of Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al. by receiving instructions from an intended recipient that a copy of the email message be made specifically for them because copying and placing the junk email in the recipients box only by request the system is able to save storage space.

Regarding claim 39, Cobb in view of AAPA and further in view of Stockwell et al. and

Sakaguchi et al. teaches the email screening method of claim 37 further comprising copying the

email message from the server storage location to a recipient-location (column 8, lines 31-34 of

Sakaguchi et al.).

Cobb in view of AAPA and further in view of Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al. does not

teach of copying emails for each recipient who so desires. Paul teaches of copying emails for

each recipient who so desires (column 1, lines 53-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the

system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA and further in view of

Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al. by copying emails for each recipient who so desires because

copying and placing the junk email in the recipients box only by request the system is able to

save storage space.

10.   Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent

No. 6,199,103 to Sakaguchi et al. in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et

al. (US Patent No. 6,072,942).

Regarding claim 19, Sakaguchi et al. receiving an email message at a server location, the

email message being addressed to a plurality of recipients; (column 8, lines 31-34); and notifying

each of the intended recipients that an email message intended for them has been placed at the

first location (column 8, lines 22-26).

Sakaguchi et al. does not teach of an email server as part of the email system and a

user interface email environment created with HTML or web pages. AAPA teaches the server

location comprising one or more servers that comprise part of an Internet-based email system

(pg.1, lines 8-10 and 18-21 of AAPA) in which, for at least some users of the system, a client

user interface email environment is generated by the system through use of HTML or web pages

that are sent via the internet to client devices and used by a browser executing on a client device

to render the user interface email environment (pg.2, lines 8-10 and 11-13 of AAPA). Therefore,

it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Sakaguchi et al. by having a

web server as part of the web-based email system and a client user interface email environment

generated through the use of HTML or web pages because this helps the system manage the

exchange of email over multiple networks and an email environment generated through web

pages is easily accessible from any client.

Sakaguchi et al. in view of AAPA does not teach placing only one copy of the email

message at a first storage location that is not a dedicated storage location for just one of the

intended recipients. Paul teaches placing only one copy of the email message at a first storage

location that is not a dedicated storage location for just one of the intended recipients (column 7,

lines 15-25, 36-50 and column 7, line 63 through column 8, lines 4).Therefore it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further

modify the modify the system and method for filtering email of Sakaguchi et al. in view of

AAPA by placing only one copy of the email message at a first storage location that is not a

dedicated storage location for just one of the intended recipients because this saves storage space

on the user system.

Sakaguchi et al. in view of AAPA and Paul does not teach of a computer program.

Stockwell et al. teaches of a computer program stored on one or more computer readable media

for processing email (column 7, lines 52-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one

having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the email

determination method and system of Sakaguchi et al. in view of AAPA and Paul by having a

computer program stored on one or more computer readable media for processing email because

the program is the software needed to direct the computer hardware on how to process emails.

Regarding claim 20, Sakaguchi et al. teaches the steps of claim 19, wherein the first storage

location is a storage location that is managed by a server associated with the server location

(column 6, lines 28-29).

Referring to claim 21, Sakaguchi et al. teaches the steps of claim 19, wherein the first

storage location is a storage location (column 8, lines 31-34) that is managed by a server

associated with the server location, and is accessible to any of the intended recipients (column 1,

lines 21-23).

11.   Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No.

6,199,103 to Sakaguchi et al. in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al.

(US Patent No. 6,072,942) as applied to claims 19-21 above, and further in view of Guck.

Regarding claim 22, Sakaguchi et al. in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of

Stockwell et al. teaches the steps of claim 19 and of notifying (column 8, lines 22-26 of

Sakaguchi et al.).

Sakaguchi et al. in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al.

does not teach of pointers. Guck teaches wherein said notifying comprises creating a pointer to

the first location, and placing the pointer at a plurality of second locations each of which being

dedicated to a different one of the intended recipients, wherein individual recipients can use the

pointer to access the email message at the first storage location (column 15, lines 54-58).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Sakaguchi et

al. in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Stockwell et al. by notifying comprising

creating a pointer to a location and recipients can use the pointer to access the email message

because this directs the recipient from their email folder to the storage location where the

unsolicited email is stored and by storing the junk emails in one location system space is saved.

12.   Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No.

6,199,102 to Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Sakaguchi et al.

Regarding claim 42, Cobb teaches of an email screening method (column 2, lines 27-29).

Cobb does teach of an email server as part of the email system and a user interface

email environment created with HTML or web pages. AAPA teaches the mail server comprising

part of an email system (pg.1, lines 8-10 and 18-21 of AAPA) in which, for at least some users of

the system, a client user interface email environment is generated by the system through use of

HTML or web pages that are sent to client devices (pg.2, lines 8-10 and 11-13 of AAPA).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb by

having a web server as part of the web-based email system and a client user interface email

environment generated through the use of HTML or web pages because this helps the system

manage the exchange of email over multiple networks and an email environment generated

through web pages is easily accessible from any client.

Cobb in view of AAPA does not teach configuring a mail server that is responsible

for storing email messages for a plurality of clients and if the email message fits the developed

profile, placing a copy of the email message in a first location and, rather than placing multiple

copies of the email message in multiple dedicated client storage locations. Paul teaches

configuring a mail server that is responsible for storing email messages for a plurality of clients

and if the email message fits the developed profile, placing a copy of the email message in a first

location and, rather than placing multiple copies of the email message in multiple dedicated

client storage locations (column 7, lines 15-25, 36-50 and column 7, line 63 through column 8,

lines 4). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view

of AAPA by configuring a mail server that is responsible for storing email messages for a

plurality of clients and if the email message fits the developed profile, placing a copy of the

email message in a first location and, rather than placing multiple copies of the email message in

multiple dedicated client storage locations because this saves storage space on the user system.

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul does not teach developing a profile of unwanted email

messages based upon whether an email message is similar in content to another email message

and if the email message fits the developed profile, placing a copy of the email message in a first

location then notifying the multiple clients that an email message addressed to them has been

received. Sakaguchi et al. teaches developing a profile of unwanted email messages based upon

whether an email message is similar in content to another email message (column 10, lines 38-

40); configuring a mail server with a filter processor that is programmed to evaluate email

messages that are received in light of the developed profile (column 3, lines 58-64); evaluating

email messages with the filter processor and determining whether the email message fits the

developed profile; and if the email message fits the developed profile, notifying the multiple

clients that an email message addressed to them has been received so that the clients can read the

email message if they so desire (column 8, lines 22-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious

to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the

system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul by developing a

profile of unwanted email messages based upon whether an email message is similar in content

to another email message and if the email message fits the developed profile, placing a copy of

the email message in a first location then notifying the multiple clients that an email message

addressed to them has been received because if a current email message is similar in content to

an email that has already been identified as an junk email than more than likely that current

email is junk as well and placing all junk email in one location saves storage space and notifying

the recipient allows them the opportunity to read the junk email.

13.   Claims 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent

No. 6,199,102 to Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Sakaguchi et al. as

applied to claim 42 above, and further in view of Stockwell et al. (US Patent No. 6,144,934).

        Regarding claim 43, Cobb teaches an email screening method (column 2, lines 27-29 of

Cobb) comprising: establishing a user interface through which a user can adjust either (b) index

values that themselves establish a degree of desirability (column 17, lines 40-41 of Cobb).

        Cobb does teach of an email server as part of the email system and a user interface

email environment created with HTML or web pages. AAPA teaches using a computer device

comprising part of an email system (pg. 1, lines 8-10 and 18-21 of AAPA) in which, for at least

some users of the system, a client user interface email environment is generated by the system

through use of HTML or web pages that are sent to client devices (pg.2, lines 8-10 and 11-13 of

AAPA). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb by

having a web server as part of the web-based email system and a client user interface email

environment generated through the use of HTML or web pages because this helps the system

manage the exchange of email over multiple networks and an email environment generated

through web pages is easily accessible from any client.

Cobb in view of AAPA does not teach email messages saved to dedicated user

storage locations. Paul teaches email messages saved to dedicated user storage locations (column

7, lines 15-25, 36-50 and column 7, line 63 through column 8, lines 4). Therefore it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system and method for filtering

email of Cobb in view of AAPA by email messages saved to dedicated user storage locations

because it saves storage space on the user system.

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul does not teach evaluating incoming email messages

against the index value that is defined by the user. Sakaguchi et al. teaches defining an index

having values that are assigned to various degrees of desirability that an email message can have,

wherein the degrees of desirability extend from a low degree of desirability to a high degree of

desirability (column 6, lines 56-67 through column 7, line 5 of Sakaguchi et al.); and establishing

a user interface through which a user can adjust either (a) individual parameter values that, in

turn, establish a degree of desirability, that email messages must have in order to be saved; and

evaluating incoming email messages against the index value that is defined by the user (column

6, lines 28-29 of Sakaguchi et al.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for

filtering email of Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul by evaluating incoming email messages

against the index value that is defined by the user because this helps the system determine which

messages the user desires to read.

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Sakaguchi et al. does not teach

of parameters. Stockwell et al. teaches of associating a plurality of parameters having parameter

values with the various degrees of desirability, wherein at least some of the parameters do not

depend on any message that is conveyed by any content of an email message (column 2, lines

19-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in

view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Sakaguchi et al. by associating a plurality of

parameters with the various degrees because to rank the desirability of reading an email certain

parameters which identify junk mail much be attached to this rank to define which emails are not

junk mail and therefore more desirable to read.

Referring to claim 44, Cobb teaches the email screening method of claim 43, wherein

the parameter values are adjustable (column 17, lines 40-41).

Regarding claim 45,Cobb teaches the email screening method of claim 43,

wherein one of the parameters is associated with the number of specified recipient addresses

(column 16, lines 25-30).

14.   Claims 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No.

6,199,102 to Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Sakaguchi et al. and

Stockwell et al. (US Patent No. 6,144,934) as applied to claims 43-45 above, and further in view

of Mullan.

Regarding claim 46, Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of

Sakaguchi et al. and Stockwell et al. (US Patent No. 6,144,934) teaches the email screening

method of claim 43 (column 2, lines 27-29 of Cobb).

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Sakaguchi et al. and

Stockwell et al. (US Patent No. 6,144,934) does not teach one of the parameters is associated

with a percentage of invalid specified recipient addresses. Mullan teaches one of the parameters

is associated with a percentage of invalid specified recipient addresses (column 10, lines 37-38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view

of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Sakaguchi and Stockwell et al. (US Patent No.

6,144,934) by having one of the parameters is associated with a percentage of invalid specified

recipient addresses because many unsolicited emails have the characteristic of having many

invalid recipient addresses in the address field of a junk email therefore this heuristic will help

identify junk emails.

15.   Claims 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No.

6,199,102 to Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Sakaguchi et al. and

Stockwell et al. (US Patent No. 6,144,934) as applied to claims 43-45 above, and further in view

of Stockwell et al. (US Patent No. 6,072,942)

Referring claim 47, 6,199,102 to Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of

Sakaguchi et al. and Stockwell et al. (US Patent No. 6,144,934) teaches the email screening

method of claim 43 (column 2, lines 27-29 of Cobb).

Cobb in view of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Sakaguchi et al. and

Stockwell et al. (US Patent No. 6,144,934) does not teach one of the parameters is associated

with the size of an email message. Stockwell et al. (US Patent No. 6,072,942) teaches one of the

parameters is associated with the size of an email message (column 15, lines 21-22 and 33-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view

of AAPA and Paul and further in view of Sakaguchi et al. and Stockwell et al. (US Patent No.

6,144,934) by having one of the parameters be associated with the size of an email message

because many unsolicited emails have the characteristic of being large in size therefore this

heuristic will help identify junk emails.

16.   Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No.

5,999,932 to Paul in view of AAPA.

Referring to claim 48, Paul teaches an email server system (column 6, lines 66-67)

comprising: a user storage database configured to store user information including email

messages that are intended for individual users (column 3, line 37); and a server configured to

receive email messages that are intended for various users (column 6, lines 51-53); to wherein

the server is further configured to screen email messages based upon a set of heuristics that

determine whether an email message likely constitutes an unwanted email message (column 1,

lines 6-9 and column 2, lines 53-54) and the server further being configured to place a single

copy of an email message in a storage location that is not a dedicated user storage location if it is

determined by screening the email message that it likely constitutes an unwanted email message

(column 7, lines 15-25, 36-50 and column 7, line 63 through column 8, lines 4).

Paul does teach of an email server as part of the email system and a user interface

email environment created with HTML or web pages. AAPA teaches said system comprising an

Internet-based system that is configured to send email messages to users in a format in which a

user's browser application processes the email messages and provides a user interface for a user

to view the email messages (pg.1, lines 8-10 and 18-21 and pg.2, lines 8-10 and 11-13 of

AAPA). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb by

having a web server as part of the web-based email system and a client user interface email

environment generated through the use of HTML or web pages because this helps the system

manage the exchange of email over multiple networks and an email environment generated

through web pages is easily accessible from any client.

17.   Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No.

5,999,932 to Paul in view of AAPA as applied to claim 48 above, and further in view of

Stockwell et al. (US Patent No. 6,072,942).

Regarding claim 49, Paul in view of AAPA teaches the email server system of claim 48

(column 6, lines 66-67 of Paul).

Paul in view of AAPA does not teach the set of heuristics considers the size of an email

message. Stockwell et al. teaches the set of heuristics considers the size of an email message

(column 15, lines 21-22 and 33-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and

method for filtering unsolicited email of Paul in view of AAPA by having the set of heuristics

consider the size of an email message because many unsolicited emails have the characteristic of

being large in size therefore this heuristic will help identify junk emails.

18.   Claim 50 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No.

5,999,932 to Paul in view of AAPA as applied to claim 48 above, and further in view of Cobb.

Referring to claim 50, Paul in view of AAPA teaches the email server system of claim 48

(column 6, lines 66-67 of Paul).

Paul in view of AAPA does not teach set of heuristics considers the number of specified

user addresses. Cobb teaches the set of heuristics considers the number of specified user

addresses that are specified by an email message (column 16, lines 25-30). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

further modify the system and method for filtering unsolicited email of Paul in view of AAPA by

having the set of heuristics consider the number of specified user addresses that are specified by

an email message because many unsolicited emails have the characteristic of having many

recipient addresses in the address field of a junk email therefore this heuristic will help identify

junk emails.

19.   Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No.

5,999,932 to Paul in view of AAPA as applied to claim 48 above, and further in view of Mullan

et al.

Referring to claim 51, Paul in view of AAPA teaches the email server system of claim 48

(column 6, lines 66-67 of Paul).

Paul in view of AAPA does not teach the set of heuristics considers the number of invalid

specified user addresses that are specified by an email message. Mullan et al. teaches the set of

heuristics considers the number of invalid specified user addresses that are specified by an email

message (column 10, lines 37-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for

filtering unsolicited email of Paul in view of AAPA by having the set of heuristics consider the

number of invalid specified user addresses that are specified by an email message because many

unsolicited emails have the characteristic of having many invalid recipient addresses in the

address field of a junk email therefore this heuristic will help identify junk emails.

20.   Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No.

5,999,932 to Paul in view of AAPA as applied to claim 48 above, and further in view of Guck.

Regarding to claim 52, Paul in view of AAPA teaches the email server system (column 6,

lines 51-53 of Paul) of claim 48 and dedicated user storage location that corresponds to a valid

specified user address contained in the email message (column 7, lines 15-25, 36-50 and column

7, line 63 through column 8, lines 4 of Paul).

Paul in view of AAPA does not teach of pointers. Guck teaches wherein the server is

further configured to place a pointer to the storage location in which the single copy of the email

message is placed (column 15, lines 54-58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and

method for filtering unsolicited email of Paul in view of AAPA by placing a pointer to the

storage location in which the single copy of the email message is placed because this directs the

recipient from their email folder to the storage location where the unsolicited email is stored and saves system space by having all junk emails in one location.

21.   Claim 53-57 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,999,932 to Paul in Cobb.

Regarding to claim 53, Paul teaches an email filtering method (column 1, lines 6-9) comprising: defining at least one heuristic that determines whether an incoming email message likely constitutes unsolicited commercial email by considering an established pattern that such unsolicited commercial email typically exhibits when it is sent; applying said at least one heuristic to at least one email message (column 2, lines 7-9) ,wherein said redirecting comprises placing a copy of the email message at a location not dedicated to storage of just one particular user's email (column 7, lines 15-25, 36-50 and column 7, line 63 through column 8, lines 4).

Paul does not teach redirecting emails are likely to be unsolicited commercial email. Cobb teaches redirecting said at least one email message if application of said at least one heuristic indicates that said at least one email message likely constitutes an unsolicited commercial email (column 3, lines 36-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering unsolicited email of Paul by redirecting emails that are likely to be unsolicited commercial email because by placing all unsolicited emails in one location the system is able to save storage space.

Referring to claim 54, Paul teaches the email filtering method of claim 53 (column 1, lines 6-9 of Paul).

Paul does not teach of redirecting an email message. Cobb teaches said redirecting comprises placing a copy of the email message at a single location from which it can be accessed by more than one intended recipient of the email message (column 3, lines 36-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering unsolicited email of Paul by said redirecting comprises placing a copy of the email message at a single location from which it can be accessed by more than one intended recipient of the email message because by placing all unsolicited emails in one location the system is able to save storage space.

Referring to claim 57, Paul teaches the email filtering method of claim 53 (column 1, lines 6-9 of Paul), wherein said at least one heuristic considers a pattern associated with the email message (column 2, lines 7-9 of Paul).

Paul does not teach at least one heuristic considers a pattern associated with the number of specified recipient addresses. Cobb teaches said at least one heuristic considers a pattern associated with the number of specified recipient addresses of the email message (column 16, lines 25-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering unsolicited email of Paul by said at least one heuristic considers a pattern associated with the number of specified recipient addresses of the email message because a large number of recipient addresses is a characteristic of unsolicited email and therefore will allow the system to identify junk email.

Regarding claim 55, Paul teaches the email filtering method of claim 53, wherein said defining comprises defining a plurality of heuristics (column 2, line 7-9) that are independent of

the message conveyed by any of the content contained in an email message (column 1, lines 43-45 and 55-57).

Referring to claim 56, Paul teaches the email filtering method of claim 53, wherein said at least one heuristic (column 2, lines 7-8) has at least one parameter that can be adjusted, and further comprising adjusting said at least one parameter to vary the pattern that is considered (column 2, lines 16-17).

22.   Claim 58 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,999,932 to Paul in view of Cobb as applied to claims 53-57 above, and further in view of Mullan et al.

Regarding claim 58, Paul in view of Cobb teaches the email filtering method of claim 53 (column 1, lines 6-9 of Paul).

Paul in view of Cobb does not teach the pattern is associated with the number of invalid specified recipient addresses. Mullan et al. teaches the pattern is associated with the number of invalid specified recipient addresses (column 10, lines 37-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering unsolicited email of Paul in view of Cobb by having the pattern be associated with the number of invalid specified recipient addresses because a large number of invalid recipient addresses is a characteristic of unsolicited email and therefore will allow the system to identify junk email.

23.   Claims 59 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,999,932 to Paul in view of Cobb as applied to claims 53-57 above, and further in view of Stockwell et al. (US Pat. No. 6,072,942).

Regarding claim 59, Paul in view of Cobb teaches the email filtering method of claim 53 (column 1, lines 6-9 of Paul) wherein said at least one heuristic considers a pattern associated with the email message (column 2, lines 7-9 of Paul).

Paul in view of Cobb does not teach at least one heuristic considers a pattern associated with the size of an email message. Stockwell et al. teaches at least one heuristic considers a pattern associated with the size of an email message (column 15, lines 21-22 and 33-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering unsolicited email of Paul in view of Cobb by having at least one heuristic consider a pattern associated with the size of an email message because an email large in size is a characteristic of unsolicited email and therefore will allow the system to identify junk email.

Referring to claim 60, Paul in view of Cobb teaches the email filtering method of claim 53 (column 1, lines 6-9 of Paul) wherein said at least one heuristic considers patterns associated with the number of specified recipient addresses of the email message (column 16, lines 25-30 of Cobb).

Paul in view of Cobb does not teach that the heuristic considers the size of the email message. Stockwell teaches the heuristic considers patterns associated with the size of the email message (column 15, lines 21-22 and 33-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering unsolicited email of Paul in view of Cobb by having the heuristic consider the size of the email message because many unsolicited emails have the characteristic of being larger size emails therefore this heuristic will help identify junk emails.

24.   Claims 61-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent

No. 5,999,932 to Paul in view of Cobb as applied to claim 53-57 above, and further in view of

Sakaguchi et al.

Regarding claim 61, Paul in view of Cobb teaches the email filtering method of claim 53

(column 1, lines 6-9 of Paul).

Paul in view of Cobb does not teach notifying at least one intended recipient that an email

message intended for them has been redirected. Sakaguchi et al. teaches after said redirecting,

notifying at least one intended recipient that an email message intended for them has been

redirected (column 8, lines 22-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for

filtering unsolicited email of Paul in view of Cobb by after said redirecting, notifying at least one

intended recipient that an email message intended for them has been redirected because this way

the recipient will know where to locate the unsolicited email if they choose to read it.

Referring to claim 62, Paul in view of Cobb teaches the email filtering method of claim 53

(column 1, lines 6-9 of Paul).

Paul in view of Cobb does not teach redirecting said at least one email message and

notifying intended recipients of the email message. Sakaguchi et al. teaches redirecting

comprising redirecting said at least one email message to a location that can be shared by a

plurality of intended recipients for reading said email message (column 8, lines 31-34), and

further comprising after said redirecting, notifying intended recipients of the email message that

an email message intended for them has been redirected to said location (column 8, lines 22-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering unsolicited email of

Paul in view of Cobb by redirecting said at least one email message and notifying intended

recipients of the email message that an email message intended for them has been redirected

because placing all unsolicited emails in one location the system is able to save storage space and

notification will allow the recipient to know where to locate the unsolicited email if they choose

to read it.

Regarding claim 63, Paul in view of Cobb teaches the email filtering method of claim 53

(column 1, lines 6-9 of Paul).

Paul in view of Cobb does not teach redirecting comprises storing only one copy of the

email message. Sakaguchi et al. teaches said redirecting comprises storing only one copy of the

email message (column 2, lines 3-4 and column 8, lines 31-34). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further

modify the system and method for filtering unsolicited email of Paul in view of Cobb by having

redirecting comprise storing only one copy of the email message because placing only one copy

of all unsolicited emails in one location the system is able to save storage space.

25.   Claim 64-67 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No.

6,199,102 to Cobb in view of Paul and Stockwell et al. (US Patent No. 6,072,942) and further in

view of Sakaguchi et al.

Regarding claim 64, Cobb teaches an email filtering method (column 2, lines 21-23 of

Cobb) comprising: receiving an email message at an email server that maintains inboxes for

individual recipients (column 2, lines 34-35 of Cobb); determining unwanted emails for the

email message at the server location based upon at least one of (b) the number of specified

recipient addresses; comparing this with a threshold value that defines a likelihood of whether an email message constitutes an unwanted email message (column 16, lines 25-30 of Cobb).

Cobb does not teach placing a copy of the email message at a first location other than an individual storage location dedicated to an individual intended recipient of the email message. Paul teaches placing a copy of the email message at a first location other than an individual storage location dedicated to an individual intended recipient of the email message (column 7, lines 15-25, 36-50 and column 7, line 63 through column 8, lines 4).Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system and method for filtering unsolicited email of Cobb by placing a copy of the email message at a first location other than an individual storage location dedicated to an individual intended recipient of the email message because this saves storage space on the user system.

Cobb in view of Paul does not teach determining unwanted emails for the email message at the server location based upon the size of the email message. Stockwell teaches determining unwanted emails for the email message at the server location based upon at least one of (a) the size of the email message (column 15, lines 21-22 and 33-35 of Stockwell et al.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of Paul by determining unwanted emails for the email message at the server location based upon the size of the email message because this is a characteristic of unsolicited email messages.

Cobb in view of Paul and Stockwell et al. does not teach calculating a score based on the patterns and comparing this score to a threshold and in turn if the threshold is exceeded placing the email in a location and sending an notification to the intended recipient. Sakaguchi et al.

teaches calculating a score based on the patterns and comparing this score to a threshold (column 6, lines 56-62) and responsive to the email message exceeding the threshold value, placing a copy of the email message at a first location (column, lines 31-34); and sending a notification to the intended recipients that a copy of an email message that was intended for them has been placed at the first location (column 8, lines 22-26).Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of Paul and Stockwell et al. by calculating a score based on the patterns and comparing this score to a threshold and in turn if the threshold is exceeded placing the email in a location and sending an notification to the intended recipient because emails that are not junk may possess some of the patterns and this score method helps the system to not junk emails that are not unsolicited emails yet they may possess a couple of characteristics of junk email.

Referring to claim 65, Cobb in view of Paul teaches the email filtering method of claim 64 (column 2, lines 21-23 of Cobb).

Cobb in view of Paul does not teach the threshold value is determined independent of the message. Stockwell et al. teaches the threshold value (column 13, lines 64-65) is determined independent of the message conveyed by any of the text that is contained in any part of the email message (column 15, lines 22 and 33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of Paul by having the threshold value be determined independent of the message conveyed by any of the text that is contained in any part of the email

message because determining junk email by the content of the message is unreliable in that it may cause the system to identify solicited mail as junk mail and vice versa.

Regarding claim 66, Cobb in view of Paul teaches junk email determination is based upon the number of specified recipient addresses (column 16, lines 25-30 of Cobb).

Cobb in view of Paul does not teach junk email determination is based upon both the size of the email message. Stockwell et al. teaches the email filtering method of claim 64, wherein junk email determination is based upon both the size of the email message (column 15, lines 21-22 and 33-35 of Stockwell et al.) and the number of specified recipient addresses (column 16, lines 25-30 of Cobb). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of Paul by junk email determination is based upon both the size of the email message because this is a characteristic of unsolicited email messages.

Cobb in view of Paul and Stockwell et al. does not teach of a score. Sakaguchi et al. teaches of a score (column 6, lines 56-58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of Paul and Stockwell et al. by calculating a score based on the patterns because emails that are not junk may possess some of the patterns and this score method helps the system to not junk emails that are not unsolicited emails yet they may possess a couple of characteristics of junk email.

Regarding claim 67, Cobb teaches the email filtering method of claim 64, wherein said first location is a storage location (column 3, lines 36-37) that is managed by the email server (column 6, lines 17-19).

26.   Claims 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No.

6,199,102 to Cobb in view of Paul and Stockwell et al. (US Patent No. 6,072,942) and Sakaguchi

et al., as applied to claims 64-67 above and further in view of Mullan et al.

Regarding claim 68, Cobb in view of Paul and Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al. teaches

the email filtering method (column 2, lines 21-23 of Cobb) of claim 64 and of threshold values

(column 13, lines 64-65 of Stockwell et al.).

Cobb in view of Paul and Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al. does not teach that the

threshold is based upon the number of invalid specified recipient addresses. Mullan teaches of

the number of invalid specified recipient addresses (column 10, lines 37-38). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

further modify the system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of Paul and Stockwell

et al. and Sakaguchi et al. by having the threshold be based upon the number of invalid specified

recipient addresses because many unsolicited emails have the characteristic of having many

invalid recipient addresses in the address field of a junk email therefore this heuristic will help

identify junk emails.

27.   Claims 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No.

6,199,102 to Cobb in view of Paul and Stockwell et al. (US Patent No. 6,072,942) and Sakaguchi

et al. as applied to claims 64-67 above, and further in view of Guck.

Regarding to claim 69, Cobb in view of Paul and Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al.

teaches the email filtering method (column 2, lines 21-23 of Cobb) of claim 64 and sending of

the notification (column 8, lines 22-26 of Sakaguchi et al.).

Cobb in view of Paul and Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al. does not teach of pointers.

Guck teaches sending of the notification comprises placing a pointer in an email folder of each

recipient of the email message (column 15, lines 54-58). Therefore, it would have been obvious

to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the

system and method for filtering email of Cobb in view of Paul and Stockwell et al. and

Sakaguchi et al. by placing a pointer in an email folder of each recipient of the email message

because this directs the recipient from their email folder to the storage location where the

unsolicited email is stored.

28.   Claims 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No.

6,199,102 to Cobb in view of Paul and Stockwell et al. (US Patent No. 6,072,942) and Sakaguchi

et al. as applied to claims 64-67 above, and further in view of Paul.

Regarding claim 70, Cobb in view of Paul and Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al. teaches

the email filtering method of claim 64 further comprising making a recipient copy of the email

message and placing the recipient copy at a dedicated recipient storage location (column 8, lines

31-34 of Sakaguchi et al.).

Cobb in view of Paul and Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al. does not teach of storing a

copy of the email responsive to a request from a recipient. Paul teaches of recipient request

(column 1, lines 53-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system and method for filtering

email of Cobb in view of Paul and Stockwell et al. and Sakaguchi et al. by storing a copy of the

email responsive to a request from a recipient because by placing the junk email in the recipients

box only by request the system is able to save storage space.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to April L Baugh whose telephone number is 703-305-5317. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-9149 for regular communications and 703-746-9149 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

ALB
June 27, 2003

RUPAL DHARIA
PRIMARY EXAMINER